

H. Kanno et al.
U.S. Serial No. 10/516,854
Page 5 of 6

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the notification of allowable subject matter, i.e., that claims 9-12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 1-13 are pending in the application. Claim 1 has been amended by the present amendment. The amendment is fully supported by the application as originally filed.

Applicants' claimed invention is directed to a rotary damper including at least first and second chambers separated by a partition wall, a rotor rotatably arranged in the first chamber, and a vane which is swingably arranged within the second chamber.

As amended, claim 1 recites that the rotor and vane are independently arranged, and the vane is swingable even without rotating the rotor.

For example, referring to FIGS. 1, 2A, and 2B of the application, the vane 12 arranged in the second chamber 5 is not attached to the rotor 6 arranged in the first chamber 4. Therefore, it is possible to swing the vane 12 even without rotating the rotor 6 (see, e.g., specification at page 10, last paragraph).

Referring to FIGS. 8-10, first and second controlled subjects (for example, an outer lid 21 and an inner lid 22, respectively) are rotatable independently of each other (see specification at page 14, 2nd paragraph). For example, if the outer lid 21 rotates, the rotor rotates, and the rotational motion of the inner lid 22 can be delayed; whereas if the inner lid 22 rotates, only the vane swings, and rotational motion of the outer lid 21 can be delayed.

Claims 1, 3-8, and 13 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,182,301 to Krueger et al. ("Krueger"). Claim 2 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krueger in view of U.S. Patent U.S. Patent 6,264,264 to Kato et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

H. Kanno et al.
U.S. Serial No. 10/516,854
Page 6 of 6

The Krueger reference does not teach or suggest a rotary damper in which a rotor and vane are independently arranged, and the vane is swingable even without rotating the rotor.

In Krueger, a retarder spring support 56 (cited in the Office Action as a "vane") is **attached** to a "rotor" (near ref. #19 in FIG. 5). As shown in FIG. 5, the "vane" 56 is not swingable unless the "rotor" is rotated (see column 7, lines 29-34 of Krueger). In other words, the rotor and vane of Krueger are not independently arranged, as recited in claim 1.

In the apparatus disclosed in Krueger, when one controlled subject (lid 18) makes rotational motion, the "rotor" rotates, and the "vane" also swings with the rotation of the "rotor." However, when only a second controlled subject (seat 17) rotates, the "rotor" does not rotate, and as a result, the "vane" does not swing (see column 7, line 13 to column 8, line 26 of Krueger). Accordingly, there is no teaching or suggestion of a vane that is swingable even without rotating the rotor, as recited in claim 1.

For at least the reasons discussed above, the Krueger reference does not anticipate or otherwise render obvious the Applicants' claimed invention as recited in claim 1.

It is believed that the claims are in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 29, 2006

By: 

Steven M. Jensen
(Reg. No. 42,693)

Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205

Phone: (617) 439-4444

Customer No. 21874